



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Scholars will probably accept at least these negative conclusions of the writer, who speaks with authority and conviction. His new theory, however, as to the origin of these monuments will hardly at once command assent: he suggests that these sculptures are the work of the northern people (of which the Philistines formed a branch) driven back from the Egyptian frontier by Rameses III in 1107, and his suggestion is sustained both by chronological considerations and by the stylistic features of the monuments. But, before a definitive conclusion can be reached as to this point, it will be necessary to decipher the inscriptions. Though not a little remains to be done, this much at least may now be positively asserted—the “Hittite” monuments are not the work of the “Cheta.”—F. DÜMLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 25.

RABOISSON. *Description géographique des anciens empires d'Assyrie d'après les documents cunéiforms. I. Tiglath Pileser I.* 8vo, pp. 84. Paris, 1890; Écoles d'Orient.

The idea of the author—of giving the geography of the various lands conquered by the several Assyrian kings according to the inscriptions of each reign—is excellent; but this is the only point for which the book can be commended. To carry such an idea into practice requires a knowledge of Assyrian and a first-hand study of the inscriptions. Menant's “translations” can by no means be accepted as a satisfactory substitute. The author shows a vicious tendency to identify names that have a similar sound, and takes much satisfaction in his *données homotopologiques et conditions isophoniques*, fair-sounding words that do not relieve the book of its diletante character.—H. WINCKLER, in *Berl. philol. Woch.*, 1891, No. 52.

CLASSICAL ARCHÆOLOGY.

MAX BENCKER. *Der Antheil der Periegesen an der Kunstschriftstellerei der Alten.* 8vo, pp. vi, 71. Munich, 1890; F. Straub. 1.80 Mark.

This well-written and sensible book opens with an account of the literary activity of Diodoros, Polemon, Heliodoros, the only persons expressly termed *περιηγηταί* in antiquity. Thus is obtained a basis for the enquiry (in ch. II) as to the significance of the *περιήγησις* in general; in ch. III the place occupied in this class of writings by the *περιήγησις Ἑλλάδος* of Pausanias is defined. The results of the investigation are summarised as follows: “*Periegesis* is a branch of what the ancients called *γραμματική*, wherein objects of antiquarian interest were described and discussed in and according to their geographical connection. Originally it had nothing to do with the literature of art and with art-history, but it came to cross them from the fact that all dealt in part with the same subjects. . . . In attempting to form